G. R. S. 59j

GPB—15,000—20 12 13

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1892-3

191.

(Madras)

File No. 24

Serial Nos.

Papers Filed.

*Month*_____

SUBJECT.

Sanctioning the re-payment of certain amount due to Sreiangachar, Archak of the Varadarajaswami temple at Bychapur, Nagade Taluk.

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.	LATER REFERENCES.



Memo

Petition No 2464 dated 1st July 1892 from Srirangachar Archik of the Varadaraja swami Temple at Bycharpur, Nagadi Taluq.

The Archikship of the temple of the Varadaraja swami at Bycharpur, Nagadi Taluq, became the bone of contention between one Srirangachar and Dikshataiya. Srirangachar's father Srinivasa Rangiah was the last Archik and died in 1876. Dikshataiya officiated as Archik on the son was a minor till 1884 when Srirangachar applied to the Inam Superintendent for a Sanad on account of the Inam The Inam Superintendent

* Cash allowance " 7-7
4 Watts Dry Cair
grain-rent " 8-4

replied that as the Temple was out of repairs, the Inam had been resumed in 1879. Shivangachar offering to pay the Survey assessment got possession of the land in 1885 and paid Rs 63/ the arrears of revenue from 1879 to 1885 — i.e. the period of resumption. Dikshatarya who had received the cash allowance was ordered to refund the amount for the period but objected thereto.

In 1885 both parties petitioned for the restoration of the Inam on their undertaking to repair the temple. Dikshatarya got an en-

6th April 1886

document in his favor p
the Dewan to the effect that
if he should repair the temple
the Inam would be restored
to him. He spent Rs 315-3-3
on the restoration of the
temple.

The statement of
repair dated 26-11-1879.

Thereupon Srinivasa
Chari also petitioned the
Dewan that the Inam
should be restored to him
and not to Dikshataiya
in as much as he was the
legal heir to the last
Archik and that he had
also offered to repair
the temple. He was, how-
ever, prepared to repay
the amount which may
have been incurred by
Dikshataiya in the repair.
The petition was referred
to the Deputy Commissioner

Dewan's order
No 915 dated
23rd June 1887.

Petition No 2193
15th December 1890
& Endorsement thereon.

who ~~sent~~ submitted a
report thereon. On the 23rd
June 1887 the following order
was passed by the Dewan:-
"The Dewan quite concurs
with the opinion of the Dis-
trict Commissioner that Dik-
shataiya has no manner
of claim to the right of
worship in the Temple.
The Inam (cash and land)
will be registered in the
name of the Temple and
left in the possession of
the pujari for the time
being."

Against this
order Dik-Shataiya
an appeal to the Council
which rejected it in the
following terms:— The
Government decline
"reopen the case dis

of so long ago as 23rd June 1887.

O.S. No 325 / 1888 on the file of the Nelamangala Munsiff's Court

Dikshataiya filed Civil suit No 325 on the file of the Nelamangala Munsiff's Court for the prosecution of the same claim which being time barred was dismissed

Appeal No 74 of 1889 was preferred before the Chief Court by Dikshataiya The Appeal was rejected on the ground that it was barred by the Law of Limitation.

Appeal No 74 / 1889 on the file of the Ch. Ct.

There being no opponent in the field, Srinivasa Char now comes forward with a petition praying that the G will be pleased to order

a refund of Rs 118-1-6
under the following circum-
stances. He had paid a
Kanbayam during the period
of the resumption of the Inam
Rs 73-8-4 he also
claims a refund of Rs 34-4
amount of Jasdik
realized and appropriated
by Dikshatraja during
the period of resumption
as well as Rs 8-11-6
arrears of Jasdik due
for the 18 months since
the order of
of the Inam.

Memorandum

On 19th June 1859, the then worshipful of the Temples of Tyckoor Vardarajaswamy and Nagady Volagara Venkatachalapathy, named Samachar, petitioned the then Amildar of Nagady, praying that, as he had become too old to perform the service, his brother's brotherinlaw Srinivasa Rangiah might be appointed his successor especially as he had no nearer heirs.

Thereupon one Seshiah filed a petition in the Taluk Cutcheri protesting against Samachar's proposal to appoint Srinivasa Rangiah as his successor, & alleging that, as he was Samachar's son, the above office must be given to him The then Amildar in an enquiry into the cas

24 - The Execution of
Seemah's suit. He was
Samachar's adopted
son was not proved.
During the Amildar's
enquiry, Deekshathiah,
father of Rangiah, who
obtained the Sowcar's
Sanad. No 397-8 of 10 April
1886, for the restoration
of the Inam attached
to Reychapur Varda:
= Rajswamy Temple,
was one of the witnesses
examined. He denied
that Seemah had been
adopted by Samachar
and raised no
objection to Samachar's
proposal to appoint
Srinivasrangiah
as his (Samachar's)
successor. The Amildar
accordingly recom=
mended the appointment,
and the late Chief Com:
duly sanctioned it
in his order No: 139
6th September 1859. The
name of Srinivasrangiah
was duly registered, as
the worshipper of the
above two temples. The
accounts show that
he enjoyed the Inam
lands as well as the
Cash

Cash allowances of the temples. The Acquittance rolls of the Cash allowances filed, show that Srinivasrayar almost invariably received the allowance and that the said Deekshathiah received them only for two months in 1868 and two months in 1873, and for one month in 1870, for which no reasons are given.

In the year 1876 the above Srinivasrayar died leaving minor sons, Sreerangachar and another. The taluk Authorities took no steps to get the office registered in the deceased's eldest son's name. Deekshathiah is said to have performed the service without any authority, ever since the death of Srinivasrayar, and to have received the cash allowances.

The Inam attached to Bychapur Vardarajaswamy temple was 4 Coodies dry land - Quit rent R a 8 - 9, and Cash allowance was 0 - 7 - 7. In the year 1879 these were resumed

resumed by the Inam Supt. on the ground that the temple was in a dilapidated condition. The taluk authorities neglected to carry out the orders of the Inam Supt.; and continued to pay the cash allowance to Deekshatiah until the matter came to the Dy. Comrs notice, which was in the year 1885.

In the year 1884 the deceased's eldest son Sreerangachar applied to the Inam Supt. for a Title Deed on account of the Inam of Beychapur Vardarajaswamy temple. The Inam Supt. gave him an Endorsement stating that the Inam had already been resumed in 1879 in consequence of the dilapidated condition of the temple. Then the above Deekshatiah also put in a similar application, and got a similar Endorsement from the Inam Supt. Shortly afterwards, the above Sreerangachar

Sraerangachar petitioned the Magd. Amildar, praying that the Inam land might be registered in his name on the full Survey assessment. Then on referring to the Inam Register, it was discovered that the Inam Supt's. order regarding the resumption had not been carried out. The Amildar reported the matter to the Dy. Comr. in May 1885, and the Dy. Comr. passed an order on 22 d. May/85 to the following effect:-

"The report displays gross carelessness on the part of the Taluk officials in not carrying out the Inam Supt's. orders. If Sraerangachar is the rightful owner, the land should be registered in his name on the Survey, the previous years' arrears, viz. 1863, being recovered from him. The Cash allowances also should be recovered from the party who drew them from the date of resumption. Accordin

Accordingly,
Sreerangachar
paid up the arrears
of Rs: 63 for the period
during which the order
of resumption was
not carried out.
Deekshatiah, who
had received the
cash allowances
during the said
period, objected
to refund the amount.
In August 1885
Sreerangachar petitioned
the Dy: Com^r offering
to restore the temple
should the Inam &c
be restored to him.

In July & August
1885, Ramjiah, son
of Deekshatiah
petitioned the Dewan
offering to repair
the temple, and
praying for the
restoration of the
Inam, & protesting
against the grant
of the land to
Sreerangachar
on survey assessment.
These petitions were
sent

sent to the Dy. Comr for report. On his letter No. 687 of 2nd October 1885 the Dewan passed the following order on 9th April 1886:—

"If the temple has been restored as alleged in Rangiah's petition of 10th February 86, or if sufft. security be given for its restoration within a fixed reasonable time, the Inams (both land & money) should be restored to the temple."

On hearing of the issue of the above order, Sreenivasachar petitioned the Dewan protesting against it, and pointing out that himself is the legal owner of the office since it devolved on his father from the original holder Sanachar in accordance with the late Chief Comr's order and that this right cannot go to the above Rangiah

Respectfully

simply increased
this Pattar. Deekshatar
took upon himself
to perform the
Service during
his (Veerasaychar's)
Minority. This
Petition was sent
to the Dy: Com[r] for
Report. The Deputy
Com[r] in his letter
Rec[d] 165 of 8th June.
1887, gives some
particulars of the
case from the
beginning, and
concludes as follows:—

It is true that
Deekshatar has
executed certain
Repairs to the temple
with the view of strengthening
his case to succeed to
the Archikship. As an
important fact it
must be noticed
that when Deekshatar
came forward & offered
to repair the temple, the
present Petitioner had also
petitioned on 16th August 1886 to
the Dy: Com[r]; saying he was

was prepared to execut
the necessary repairs
if the Trustee amount
allowed for the temple,
was given to him. The
Petitioner's intention, as
will be observed in his
letter dated 6th May/86 to the
Office, appears to be genuine
when he offered to repay
to Deekshatiah the cost
(as may be estimated
by the P. W. D. or by Punchayat
which the latter had
incurred in carrying
out the repairs of the
temple I therefore
consider that the
Petitioner should be
the Architect of the
Varadaraja Swamy temple
and he should also
get the Trustee amount
allotted to the temple
He must be made
to pay all the money
spent by Deekshatiah
on the repairs of the
temple."

Memorandum

on

letter Eccl: 165-878 June 1887 from Bangalore Dy: Comr, with record records regarding the Archdeacon of Bycheapeir Vardaraja Perumal Temple, Nagapatam Talk.

Refd. that the Devasthanam Entitle of the Bhoomi Dhan & that Archdeacon has no manner of Claim & the right of worship in the temple. The Examn (Cash & Kind) will be upheld in the Hundi of the temple & left in the possession of the Trustee concerned

22/6/83

Received
20 ಫೆಬ್ರವರಿ
244

on R. Hamp

ಸೈಫುಲ್ಲಾಖಾನ್ ಸಾಹೇಬರು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಕಡೆಯಿಂದ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಅರ್ಜಿಯ ಮೇರೆಗೆ ಸದರಿ ಸಾಹೇಬರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಸದರಿ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂಬರಿನ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ

ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಪಡಿಸಿದ ಕರಾವಳಿ ಪ್ರದೇಶ —

ಮೇಲೆ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂಬರಿನ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಪೂರ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂಬರ್ 9-11 ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಅಂಜನಾದೇವಿ ಇವರ ಜಮೀನು ಪಶ್ಚಿಮಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂಬರ್ 9-11 ಶ್ರೀ ಪ್ರಭಾಕರ ಇವರ ಜಮೀನು ಉತ್ತರಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂಬರ್ 9-11 ಶ್ರೀ ಪ್ರಭಾಕರ ಇವರ ಜಮೀನು ದಕ್ಷಿಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂಬರ್ 9-11 ಶ್ರೀ ಪ್ರಭಾಕರ ಇವರ ಜಮೀನು ಇದೆ. ಈ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮಾರು 30 ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಅಡಿಕೆ ಮರಗಳು ಬೆಳೆದಿದ್ದು ಸುಮಾರು 15 ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಅಡಿಕೆ ಫಸಲು ಬರುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಈ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮಾರು 1000 ಅಡಿಕೆ ಮರಗಳಿದ್ದು ಪ್ರತಿ ವರ್ಷ ಸುಮಾರು 100 ಕ್ವಿಂಟಾಲ್ ಅಡಿಕೆ ಫಸಲು ಬರುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಈ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮಾರು 50 ತೆಂಗಿನ ಮರಗಳಿದ್ದು ಪ್ರತಿ ವರ್ಷ ಸುಮಾರು 5000 ತೆಂಗಿನಕಾಯಿ ಫಸಲು ಬರುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಈ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮಾರು 20 ಬಾಳೆ ಗಿಡಗಳಿದ್ದು ಪ್ರತಿ ವರ್ಷ ಸುಮಾರು 200 ಬಾಳೆಗೊನೆ ಫಸಲು ಬರುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಈ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮಾರು 10 ಕಾಳುಮೆಣಸಿನ ಬಳ್ಳಿಗಳಿದ್ದು ಪ್ರತಿ ವರ್ಷ ಸುಮಾರು 10 ಕೆ.ಜಿ. ಕಾಳುಮೆಣಸು ಫಸಲು ಬರುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಈ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮಾರು 5 ಜಾಯಿಕಾಯಿ ಮರಗಳಿದ್ದು ಪ್ರತಿ ವರ್ಷ ಸುಮಾರು 5 ಕೆ.ಜಿ. ಜಾಯಿಕಾಯಿ ಫಸಲು ಬರುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಈ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮಾರು 2 ಲವಂಗ ಮರಗಳಿದ್ದು ಪ್ರತಿ ವರ್ಷ ಸುಮಾರು 2 ಕೆ.ಜಿ. ಲವಂಗ ಫಸಲು ಬರುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಈ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮಾರು 1 ಏಲಕ್ಕಿ ಗಿಡವಿದ್ದು ಪ್ರತಿ ವರ್ಷ ಸುಮಾರು 1 ಕೆ.ಜಿ. ಏಲಕ್ಕಿ ಫಸಲು ಬರುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಈ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮಾರು 1 ಕೊಕ್ಕೋ ಮರವಿದ್ದು ಪ್ರತಿ ವರ್ಷ ಸುಮಾರು 1 ಕೆ.ಜಿ. ಕೊಕ್ಕೋ ಫಸಲು ಬರುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಈ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮಾರು 1 ಜಾಯಿಕಾಯಿ ಮರವಿದ್ದು ಪ್ರತಿ ವರ್ಷ ಸುಮಾರು 1 ಕೆ.ಜಿ. ಜಾಯಿಕಾಯಿ ಫಸಲು ಬರುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಈ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮಾರು 1 ಲವಂಗ ಮರವಿದ್ದು ಪ್ರತಿ ವರ್ಷ ಸುಮಾರು 1





9/01257



MORE

9.11.84

1/8/85



No 366.

Office of the Dewan of Coorg
Bangalore 4th Oct 1885

Memorandum

The accompanying petn No: 1484 of 16th August 1885 from Shirumalla Deekshithiengar resident of Magadi is forwarded to the Deputy Commr of Bangalore for information; if the temple is restored, the restoration of the Inam will be considered.

By order

Secretary

ಕಾಲಿಗೆ ಬಿದ್ದು ಅಳುತ್ತಾ ಬೇಡಿಕೊಂಡಳು. ಆಗ ಅವಳ ಗಂಡ ಅವಳನ್ನು ಎಬ್ಬಿಸಿ ಸಮಾಧಾನ ಮಾಡಿ ಹೇಳಿದ, "ಇಲ್ಲಿ ನೋಡು, ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ನಿನಗೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ನಿನ್ನ ಮಕ್ಕಳಿಗೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದನ್ನು ಮಾಡು

7/2/86

No 3606

ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಲಾಯಿತು.

ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡಿಸಿದ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾವನೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆ

No. 278

Mysore Dewan's Office,
Petition Department.

Official Memorandum.

The accompanying Petition No. 1251, dated 28 July 1885, received at the Dewan's Office from Timmaya Bhatt, Kariamaspalle and others of Bychapur &c. Villages in the Magadi Taluk is forwarded, together with its ——— enclosures to the Deputy Commissioner of the Bangalore District for Report.

Bangalore,
3 August 1885.

Draft

By Order,

A. Ry Secretary.

I
C-119

(General Serial No. 34.)

No. 1251

ENDORSEMENT.

In reply to his Petition, dated ~~10th August~~ 28th July 1885—

Rungiah son of Deekshalich of Tirumale, Nagady Taluk

is informed that

if the temple has been restored as alleged his petition dated 10th Feb 1886, or if sufficient security be given for its restoration within a fixed reasonable time the Inams (both land & money) ~~should~~ will be restored to the temple.

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,
PETITION DEPARTMENT,
16 April 1886.

By Order,

Draft RM.

Chief Secretary.

Mysore Government Press, Bangalore.—7-9-85.—2,000.

ಅಂತಹ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಕಾಂಡಿಷನ್ಸ್ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು

ಮೊದಲನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಹೆಣ್ಣು ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಕಾಲೇಜಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಬಾರದು ಎಂಬುದು ಒಂದು ಕಾಂಡಿಷನ್ ಆಗಿತ್ತು. ಎರಡನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಹೆಣ್ಣು ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಬಾರದು ಎಂಬುದು ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಕಾಂಡಿಷನ್ ಆಗಿತ್ತು. ಮೂರನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಹೆಣ್ಣು ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಮನೆಯಿಂದ ಹೊರಗೆ ಹೋಗಬಾರದು ಎಂಬುದು ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಕಾಂಡಿಷನ್ ಆಗಿತ್ತು. ಹೀಗೆ ಹಲವಾರು ಕಾಂಡಿಷನ್ಸ್ ಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿ ಹೆಣ್ಣು ಮಕ್ಕಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಕಾಲ ಬದಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಹೆಣ್ಣು ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಕಾಲೇಜಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕು, ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕು, ಮನೆಯಿಂದ ಹೊರಗೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕು ಎಂಬ ಕಾಲ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇಂದಿಗೂ ಕೆಲವು ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಣ್ಣು ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಕಾಲೇಜಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಬಾರದು, ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಬಾರದು, ಮನೆಯಿಂದ ಹೊರಗೆ ಹೋಗಬಾರದು ಎಂಬ ಕಾಂಡಿಷನ್ಸ್ ಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿ ಹೆಣ್ಣು ಮಕ್ಕಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ತಪ್ಪು. ಹೆಣ್ಣು ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಕಾಲೇಜಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕು, ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕು, ಮನೆಯಿಂದ ಹೊರಗೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕು. ಇದು ಸರಿಯಾದ ಕಾಲ.

2 / 87.
No. 660

Mysore Dewan's Office,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

Vasan to 165 87

Official Memorandum.

The accompanying Petition No. 3099, dated 2d January 1887 received at the Dewan's Office from Sreerangachar arachik of Varadaraja Swamy Devasthan, Bylapur, Bangalore Taluk is forwarded, together with its one enclosures, to the Deputy Comm^r of Bangalore District for Report after enquiry

Camp ~~BANGALORE~~, Mysore
12 January 1887.

Draft- RK

By Order,

Chief Secretary.

Mysore Government Press, Bangalore.—5-10-86.—2000.

ಅಕ್ಷರಗಳನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಬರೆಯುವುದು ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗಳನ್ನು ಬರೆಯುವುದು ಮತ್ತು ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಗುರುತಿಸುವುದು ಮತ್ತು ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಉಚ್ಚರಿಸುವುದು ಮತ್ತು ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಬರೆಯ

ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿ

COURT FEE

RE

ONE ANNA

ಸಂ 1237.

9/9/87 16

No 16

As the case has already been disposed of in connection with the re-opened P.C. 16/9/87

K. Seshadry Iyer Esq: C.S.I
Dewan to His Highness the
Maharaja of Mysore

The humble petition of Dikshathea residing at Tirumalé, attached to Magady Taluk, Bangalore Dist.

Most Humbly and Respectfully Sheweth

That aggrieved by the (Bangalore) Deputy Commrs (Assistant's) endorsement No. 231 dy 9th July 1887, to the effect that the Petitioner is not the proper Claimant for the Archekship of Varadarajaswamy Temple at Byelapur, attached to Magadi Taluk, that the Claim of one Srinivasa Iyengar Char has been established and that the Petitioner should relinquish the Inam land &c which is in his possession and make over the same to the said Srinivasa Char receiving the amount expended by the Petitioner towards the repairs of the Temple, the Petitioner begs most respectfully to approach your honor with this humble appeal humbly trusting that your honor would be graciously pleased after due Consideration of the

of the Circumstances hereunder complained, to repeal the said Order of the 8th June and pass an order to that effect.

That the above Order having purported that the matter of right therein Communicated had also been reported to and received sanction of your Honor, the Petitioner obtained Copy of the Dy Commissioner's report No: 165 dy 8th June 1887 which appeared to have formed the ground work for an unjust disposal of the Petitioner's Claims. * Appendix B.
On a reference thereto it became fully apparent that the matter was handled in a lackadaisical state and that the Dy Commr took no pains whatever to enter deeply into the Case, Summoning the Petitioner's presence to defend his Claim, but reported the Circumstance to your Honor as it was laid before him by the opposite party Rajah Sreeramoochee. Before refuting the several inconsistent and incorrect points referred to in the Deputy Commrs report in question, the Petitioner feels it his duty to acquaint your Honor with the nature of the Case under dispute, in order that a proper Conclusion may be arrived at. The following is the brief narration of it:-

That the temple above referred to is maintained by Circar grants in ready money and Inam Land. The Archek enjoying the said grants is required to perform the temple services. One Vira Kuttee Chetty the father of the Petitioner was the original holder of the office of Archek - He subsequently made a gift of half the Inam Land and half the Claim of his Archekship

to his brother-in-law (sister's husband) Tirumalachar as a dowry to his sister Ever since, these two persons carried on the Services of the Temple jointly by turn but enjoyed the Inam land in a divided state. The ready money grant being intended for the Current expenses of the ordinary Devasthan it was unmeddled with and unobliged in the requirements of the temple, the original Archek receiving it from the Taluk Cutchery. In this state things continued to pass on, until the Petitioner (the son of the original holder) and Samachar (the brother of the Assignee) succeeded to perform the Services of the Office, when the latter (Samachar) who was bent by age and quite infirm resigned his right and title to his share of Archekship in favor of one Srinivasarungia. This latter person dying in 1873 left two minor Sons viz: Srirungachar (the original petitioner) and Tirumalachar and during their minority one Somia acted as their guardian and performed the Temple Services on their behalf. In 1879 when the Inam Settlement of the Nagapatam Taluk was effected, the Superintendent ordered the attachment of the Inam land as the temple buildings were then found to be in a State of utter disrepair. For some reason or the other the Taluk authorities did not immediately carry out the said order. This negligence coming to the notice of the Dy Commr he ordered the strict enforcement of the Inam Superintendent's order and the land was thereupon attached. The

petitioner tried his utmost to have necessary repairs executed to the temple and many a time asked Springachar who had then attained his majority to contribute his share of money for the purpose but he never consented to it. While in this state, Springachar with the intent of becoming the sole proprietor of the land quietly & against the Consent of the Petitioner presented a tender for the attached Inam land being conferred on him on Kandayam tenure and accordingly obtained it — The Petitioner thereupon petitioned your honor and obtained an endorsement to the effect that the Inam land will be restored to his possession if the necessary repairs be executed to the temple and accordingly the work having been carried out by him the land was restored — Vide appendixes C. D. E. At this stage, Springachar finding himself divested of the land which he had unjustly taken up for full assessment, came forward advancing his claim which he had ere long lost (Vide Appendix F.) and put in an application to your honor ~~that the Inam land~~ urging he was the rightful claimant and that the Inam land should be made over to his possession as he is willing to make good the amount expended by the Petitioner towards the repairs of the Temple — The said application having been referred to the Surveyor for enquiry & report

the Letter no: 165 dt 8th June 87 appears to have been addressed to your honor, Explicitly contrary to former public records.

That after narrating in the above the facts of the Case the Petitioner begs permission to refute the Several points referred to by the Vi, Comm.r hereunder in a precise manner.

The points referred to in dispute Comm.rs no: 165 dt 8th June 1887.
Appendix B.

1) "I have the honor to state that the petitioner Srinivasachar appears from the records to be the Son of one Srinivasa Ranga who derived his title to the Archekship of the temple from one Ramachar the original holder of the office."

Refutatory Statement of the Petitioner.

The present Petitioner Concurs so far that Srinivasachar is the Son of Srinivasa-Ranga but objects to the originality Conferred upon Ramachar, Venkatarangachar (the father of the Petitioner Dikshatia) being the original holder - Vide Sanad bearing the Seal and Signature of the late Dewan Purnia - marked G. in the Appendix, - but subsequently the Sons of the original holder viz Srinivasachar & Rangachar followed to the office in Succession - Vide appendices H. I. J. - The name of Srinivasachar referred to in H and I. is the Assignee and brother-in-law of Venkatachar and brother of Ramachar.

2) "This latter individual (as will be seen from order dated 16th Sept 1859 No: 13 from the Secretary to the Commissioner of Mysore to the Amildar of Magadi) is the brother-in-law of his elder brother

The transfer of the right in question was sanctioned by the Secretary on the movement of Ramachar, who held but half the right of Archekship and it therefore may be rightly presumed that not the full right but only his half was

(Cousin) and that he made over owing to his advanced age and bodily infirmity, his right to the Archekship of the Temple as well as to the Inam attached thereto."

then taken to Account. If this is not a safe presumption the deed of transfer which was executed by Sawachar in favor of Srinivasaraugia the father of Srinivasa Raugachar which is still in possession of the latter, and in which only half the right of Archekship is mentioned may be ordered to be produced and examined. —

(3) "It appears from the records in the Case that at about this time one Seenaya a distant Cousin of Sawachar put forth his claims to succeed to the Office of Archek and that one Dickshatia who was examined as a witness appears to have acquiesced in the appointment of Srinivasaraugia to the Archekship, in as much as he then raised no objections nor did he put forward his claims to succeed Sawachar."

Dickshatia now represented to the Petitioner himself. Certainly he was not justified in raising any objection to the succession of another person to the right of Shawachar's share of Office and he no doubt acquiesced in the appointment of Srinivasaraugia — Sawachar had also executed another deed of transfer in favor of Seenaya the person referred to by the Respondents in that it was already mentioned that only this portion of the Office of Archekship was transferred. The petitioner requests that the same may be sent for & perused for reference. —

(4) "Dickshatia who now disputes the Petitioner's Claim to the Archekship came forward taking advantage doubtless of his Cousins being Minors to perform the duties of the Archek, and received upto 1884 the usual Thustik amount from the Talook"

It is left to your honor to judge how far the Respondents was right in stating on the face of so many documentary evidences that Dickshatia (the Petitioner who is the right person to hold the office) took advantage of the minority of Srinivasachar, supported as he was by an active and vigilant guardian Samia by name (his own brother-in-law) but as for receiving payment the Petitioner did it no doubt as he used to do from the very beginning — The petitioner cannot

he takes for an usurper in as much as he is in possession of tangible authority to prove [illegible] but he thinks it pertinent to question the claim of Spirungachar who possesses not a single documentary evidence except the deed of transfer which was executed in his father's favor by Samachar, and which he evades to produce in presence of the Authorities with the sole intention of unjustly establishing his full claim for the office of archek — misguiding the Authorities by untenable defence. —

5). "Under these circumstances it appears to me, Considering the claims of the petitioner + Dickshatia as elicited from the records and the subsequent depositions given by certain pujots and others examined by Mr. Syed Nasserodin, which are herewith submitted, that the petitioner has a stronger claim to the office of Archek."

The Petitioner begs to point out that none of the depositions taken from the pujots by Mr. Nasserodin or any other Government Officer nor any other public records establish full right of Archekship to Spirungachar and they purport more to the effect that Spirungachar and Dickshatia were enjoying it as will be observed from the latter part of para 6 of the Dy Commrs Report and Appendix Ia and Spirungachar himself in a petition addressed to the Swami Supt (Vide appendix K.) admits the fact more or less — In fact Dickshatia has a stronger claim to the office than Spirungachar but the Deputy Commissioner I am sorry, has been misled in this respect. — To support further his claim, petitioner produces the statement of Treasury money grant Chief Court's decision in his favor — Vide Appendices M & N.

(6) "It must be noticed that when Srinivasachar came forward and undertook to repair the temple in question the present petitioner had also petitioned on the 16th August 1885 to the Dy Commr saying he was prepared to execute the necessary repairs if the Inadik amount allowed for the Temple was given to him"

Srinivasachar had certainly petitioned to that effect; but when? In August 1884 i.e. more than a year after Dikshatia obtained permission (in Feb/84) and when the temple repairs had half finished nearly. But what was the result of Srinivasachar's petition? Major McIntire rejected his claims - Vide Appendix F in as much as he had obtained the Inam land attached to the temple for full assessment. It may also be supposed that the present opinion of the Dy Commr is quite contrary to that he had conveyed in the above order (Appendix F.)

(7) "The petitioner's intention as will be seen observed in his Letter dated 6th May 1886 to this Office appears to be genuine, when he offered to repay to Dikshatia the Cost (as may be estimated by the Public Works Department or by Punchayets) which the latter had incurred in Carrying out the repairs of the Temple. I therefore Consider that the Petitioner should be the Archek of the Varadarayaswamy Temple and he should also get the Inadik amount allotted to the Temple. He must be made to pay all the money spent by Dikshatia on the repairs of the Temple."

This portion requires much to be argued upon - The Petitioner is not aware under what ground the Dy Commissioner, undervalued his claims and held that of Srinivasachar superior - It is a fair question to be proposed that why the latter person failed at the outset to Come forward to execute the repairs of the Temple, altho Petition moved him several times and why he should have obtained the Inam land for full assessment and from why he has been dissembling facts by stating that he was,

indespite of so many evidences, the Sole proprietor of the office of Archek. All these no doubt go to each Show that he tried to usurp the whole Claim but when he saw Dickshtia put in possession of the land after necessary repairs having been executed to the temple malice appears to have worked in his heart he shewed himself to be the genuine Claimant and put in an application to your honor offering to pay the Cost of the repairs if he be placed in possession of the Inam land - It is left to your honor to pledge how far he is justified in making such an application and how far the Dy Commr was right in upholding his unjust Cause

That under these Circumstances the Petitioner craves that the whole Records Connected with the Case may be Called for and perused to before an Order is passed, as the Deputy Commissioner appears to have reported on the Case without

a full reference to past records. Should your honor entertain any doubt as to who would be the proper Claimant to Enjoy the office of Archeshtaship and the Inam land, the Petitioner prays that he may be referred to Civil Court for Remedy — but should your honor consider that the Records stand strong in his favor he may at once be Confirmed in his right and order ~~may~~ issued to the Dy Comm^r Bangalore to pay him all the arrears of Thustik Amount.

For this act of Kindness the petitioner shall as in duty bound ever pray for your honors long life & prosperity.

Mysore
9 Sep^r 1887

(General Serial No 34)

No 1640 ENDORSEMENT.

In reply to his Petition, dated 9th September 188

Deekshitaiya of Sirumale, Nagadi

& Co &c

is informed that

As the case has already been disposed of, it cannot now be reopened. The Enclosures are returned.

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,
PETITION DEPARTMENT,
13th October 1887.

By Order,
Chief Secretary

Mysore Government Press, Bangalore.—7-9-85.—2,000.

3482

2021.

3682

(General Serial No. 32.)
189

No. 2193

Name of Petitioner. Dikshitacharyar

Village. Baichapur

Taluk. Magadi

District. Bangalore

Date of Arzi. 19.12.90

Date of Receipt. Do

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Two.

Submitted to the Council with references.
23/2/91 AR

ABSTRACT.

Appeals against the decree of the Munsiff of Bangalore Do., dated 14/11/90, dismissing as barred by the Law of Limitation, Petr's. claim to half share of the Archakship in the Varada rajaswami Temple in the Baichapur village.

Re Govt decline to re-open the case disposed of so long ago as 23d June 1887.
AR
22/6/91

19

No. 2193



20/12/90

Petition as 19/12/

2

In the Court of His Excellency the Dewan of Mysore

A.S. No of 1890

Dikshitayangar - Plaintiff - appellant

vs

1 - Srirangachar
2 - Srirumalachar minor by his guardian 1st Defendant } Defendants - Respondents

The Plaintiff appeals to this Honorable Court against the decree of the Treasury Assistant Commissioner, Bangalore District of 14th Nov. 90 in O.S. No 4/90 for the following reasons namely, —

1. That the suit being one for a declaration of the Plaintiff's Hak as archak it is not barred the Law Limita



ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ.

ಸಕ್ 1890 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ನಂಬರು.

ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ,

ಗೆ.

ಬರೆಸಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್ ನಾಮೆ.

ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ, ಅರ್ಜಿ ವಗೈರೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು, ವಿವಾದಿಸಿ ಫೈಸಲ್ ಹೊಂದತಕ್ಕ ಬಗ್ಯೂ, ಮತ್ತು ನನಿಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲತಕ್ಕ ಡಿಕರಿ ಮೊಬಲಗು ದಸ್ತೈವಜು ವಗೈರೆ ತೆಗದು ಕೊಂಡು ರಶೀದಿ ಕೊಡುವದಕ್ಕೂ ಸಹಾ ತಮಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ, ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ನನಿಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ ನಡೆಸುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಖುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದು ನಡಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ತಾರೀಖು 19 ನೇ ಡಿಸೆಂಬರ್

ಸಕ್ 1890 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ.

ರುಜು

ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ ಇರುತ್ತೇನೆ.

W.C. Alasingarachar

19.12.90

ಈ ಮೊಕ್ತ್ಯಾರ್ ನಾನು ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯುಸ್ಥರು ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ರುಜು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾ ಕ್ಕೆ, ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಸರಟಿಸ್ಫೈ ಮಾಡಿದೇನೆ.

W.C. Alasingarachar



No 3656



1885.

No. - 1484

Name - Ranganatha for of Terumala Krishnatha Iyengar

Village -

Taluk - Magadi

District or Sub Div. } - Bangalore

Date of Arzi - 16th August -

Date of Receipt -

No. of Enclosures -

Subject -

State that Petitioner hears that the Inam land granted to him for the upkeep of the Varadaraja Swami temple in Sijapur and held by him from a long time, is likely to be given away to Sri Rangathar for Kandayam, owing to the dilapidated condition of the temple.

Petitioner on July 13.

Save the Dewan in favour

To the Commissioner
N: The temple is reported for restoration of the Inam will be recommended

requested that the Imam should not be given away to any person or lent himself and agreed to repair the temple within 3 months.

The temple is being repaired with necessary materials and the Builder of the Talek, if asked, will testify to this fact.

Petitioner requests that the hereditary Imam land may be confirmed ~~in him~~ and promises to give Entire Satisfaction in the management of the temple.

Our amma
Khan

No. 2193

From Venkatarangaya of
Kaichapur Village,
Nagara Taluk. Endorsement. 22/6/91.

In reply to his Petition dated 19th December 1890

Petitioner is informed that the Govt. decline to re-open the case disposed of so long ago as 23rd June 1887.

~~is informed that~~

The enclos: are herewith returned.

Drafted as per
C's order.

By Order,

for Chief Secretary.

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,
PETITION DEPARTMENT,
22nd June 1891.
3/7

AR

Endorsement
received
3/7/91

7/7/85

(General Serial No. 30.)

188

From

The Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.

To The Dy Comm^r of the Bangalore Dt

Dated

Despatched 31 July 1885

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 499
No.

Petition No 943 dated 31st July 1885 from Rangiah son of Deekshith Iyengar of Thirumalé Nidagadu Taluk

" "

forwarded to the Dy Comm^r - From petitioner's own admission before the undersigned, he has not yet begun the repairs to the temple. He asks for 3 months time within which he undertakes to complete the work. This may be granted provided the land has not been given

(General Serial No. 29.)

1885-86. 23

From The Dy Commissioner
Bangalore District

To

The Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.

Dated 2nd October 1885.

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. 3 + one

General No. 2 } 1885-86.
No. 687

Reports on petition
from Rungiah son
of Seekshtiah of Tirumale
in the Magady Taluk.

noted

Order.

If the temple has been restored
as alleged in Rangaya's Petn of 10
Feb 1886, or if Suffn security be
given for its restoration within a
fixed reasonable time, the
Inams (both land & money) shd
be restored to the temple.

9/4/86

B. No. 16

Dy. Commissioner's Office
Bangalore District.
Dated 2nd October 85.

To

The Secretary to the
Govt. of Mysore

Sir,

With reference to your Nos. 199 and 278 dated respectively the 7th July and 5th August last, forwarding for report a petition from Rungiah Son of Deekshitals of Tirumale in the Magady Taluk, regarding the Inams attached to Varadaraja Swamy temple in Bychapoor in the Magady Taluk, I have the honor to state that, owing to the failure on the part of the poojaries, to repair the temple, notwithstanding repeated warnings from the Inam Department at the time of the Inam Enquiry

the grants that had been made to the institution both in land and money (by monthly payments) were resumed; but through the negligence of the Taluk officers, the order of resumption was not given effect to until the error was found out, and orders were issued in May last to stop the money payment and to recover the Kandayam on the land from the date of resumption. Accordingly the petitioner, who had received the money payments, unauthorizedly, was called on to refund such amounts, while the land was confirmed on Kandayam tenure to the individual (Seerangachar) in whose possession and enjoyment it was.

The

The temple has not, as yet, been repaired, but it would appear that the petitioner is collecting materials therefor.

2 The vernacular papers bearing on the subject are herewith submitted.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obe dient servant

Dy Commissioner

Read:—

Letter No: 687 of 2nd
1885 from
Comr. of Bangalore,
reporting on petition
of Rungiah, son of
Deakshatiah of
Tirumalé in the
Magady Taluk, as to
the circumstances
under which the Inams
attached to the Varda-
-rajaswamy Temple
at Byrchapur, were
resumed.

No 3 97-8
14

Order 10/4/86

If the temple has been
restored as alleged
in Rungiah's petition
dated 16th February 1886,
or if sufficient security
be given for its restoration
within a fixed reasonable
time, the Inams (both
land & money), should be
restored to the temple.

To The Dy: Com[r]; Bangalore, returning Chief Secretary
Sd: papers.
Comm[r]

(General Serial No. 31.)

188 .

From

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 397-80

No. 14,

Transmitted for 165

Refer
11. 1. 1886 [illegible]

(General Serial No. 29.)

1885-86 7120.

From The Dy Commissioner
Bangalore District

To

The Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.

Dated 9th January 1886.

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. /

General No. 969 } 1885-86.

Dewan's Official Memo
No 630 of 23rd Ultimo,
calling for report on the
Petition of one Srirungacha
Verlu K of Varadaraja Temple
in the Magadi Taluk

In returning the
petition, has the honor
to state that the entire
record relative to the
petitioner's case has already
been submitted with this
Office No 687 dated 2nd
5086.

14/1

Defaulter list, from which it will be seen that the Inam Land has been given out on Lindayem to the petitioner, who is the right & poojari to the Temple in question

A Macauley
By Commissioner

W.S.

C. V. 8/
16/6/87

Rules
14/6

L. P. V.
Brees.
14.6.87

General Serial No. 29.)



From The Dy Commissioner
Bangalore District

To The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Dated 8th June 1887.
Despatched 9th.
Received

Enclosures No. 1 file

General No. 2 } 1887-88.
D No. 165.

Reports on petition
from Sreerangabhatta
Archik of Varadaraja
Swami Davastan, Bychapur
Magady Taluk.
" "

By Commissioner's Office
Bangalore District
Dated 8th June 1887.

D. No. 165.

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.

Sir,

With reference to the petition dated 2nd January 1887, addressed to the Dewan by one Sreerangachar, Archik of the temple of Varadaraja-Swami in Bychapoor of the Magady Taluk, and which was forwarded to this Office for report under Cover of your Official Memo No. 660 dated 12th January last, I have the honor to state that the petitioner Sreeranga-Char appears from the records to be the Son of one Sreenevasaiengiah, who derived his title to the Archik-Ship of the temple from one Shamachar

inclosures returned

the original holder of the office. This latter individual (as will be seen from order dated 16th September 1859, No. 13, from the Secretary to the Commissioner of Mysore to the Amildar of Magady) is the brother-in-law of his elder brother (? Cousin) and that he made over, owing to his advanced age and bodily infirmity his right to the Archikship of the temple, as well as to the Inam attached thereto.

2. It appears from the records in the case that at about this time one Seenaya a distant Cousin of Shamabhar, put forth his claims to succeed to the office of Archik, and that one Deekshatiah, who was examined as a witness appears to have acquiesced in the appointment of Sreenivasarangiah to the Archikship, inasmuch as he

then raised no objections, nor did he put forward his claims to succeed Shamabhar-

3. About the year 1873, Sreene-
-vasavengiah died leaving the pre-
-sent petitioner and his brother as minors. Deekshatiah who now disputes the petitioner's claim to the Archikship came forward taking advantage doubtless of his cousins being minors, to perform the duties of the Archik, and received up till 1884 the usual Tusdik amount from the Taluk. It must be stated here that in 1879 when the Inam Settle-
ment was effected, the dilapidated condition of the temple of Varadaraja-
-Swamy appears to have attracted at-
tention, and an order was accordingly issued directing the resumption of the Inam. This order, however, was not given effect to, through the negligence of the Taluk authorities

to whom it had of course been communicated.

4. In 1884, the petitioner applied to the Guam Department for the grant of a title-deed for the Settlement of the Guam; but the Guam Department refused the petitioner's request on the ground that the Guam in question had been ordered to be resumed in 1879, which order was not carried out. The petitioner then represented his case to Mr. Ricketts and requested that the Guam might be granted to him on full assessment in consideration of his claim to the land, and the Dy Commissioner in his order No. 131 dated 12th May 1885, directed that if the petitioner was the Registerdar the land might be given to him on full assessment and the arrears of Revenue viz. Rs. 63/ for 6 years past, during which time

the order

the order of resumption was not given effect to should be recovered from the petitioner. The order further directed that the Insdik amount of the past 6 years should be recovered from the person to whom it had been disbursed. Deekshatah the cousin of the present petitioner, who had received the Insdik amount all along, objected to refund the same, but offered in lieu to do the needful repairs to the temple, if the land which has always been held and enjoyed as Inam by the petitioner was given to him. In a petition addressed by him to the Dewan on the subject he made the same statement and the petition was received in this office with your docket No. 199 dated 7th July 1885, with directions that 3 months time may be granted to carry out the repairs if the land

had not already been given out, and a report was made in this Office No. 687 of the 2nd October 1885 that the land had been confirmed on Kandayan tenure to the present petitioner (Eeerangalchar) and that Deekshatiah was collecting materials for the repairs. In Proceedings of the Dewan No. 397-8/14 orders were passed directing the restoration of the Inam, if the Temple was restored

5. In pursuance of this order the necessary Title-deed for the land was obtained from the Inam Department and issued to Rungiah son of Deekshatiah.

6. I would add for the information of the Dewan that Mr. Syed Naserudeen made a personal enquiry into the claims of the petitioner and his opponent Deekshatiah in January last, when he was engaged in the

Jamabundi of the Nagadi Taluk.
The Potél denies all knowledge of the matter as he has held his office for a short time only. The Ryots stated that both Sreerangachar and Deekshatiah were enjoying the land in question, performing the temple services each in his turn, and that both of them have been disputing their respective rights to the Archikship. The Toty stated that Sreerangachar was enjoying the produce of the land of a whole Mo and getting besides a half share of the produce of another Mo with Deekshatiah.

7. Under these circumstances it appears to me, considering the claims of the Petitioner and Deekshatiah, as elicited from the records, and the subsequent depositions given by certain Ryots and others

examined by Mr Syed Nasrudeen, which are herewith submitted, that the petitioner has a stronger claim to the office of Archik. His father, as already stated, held the office uninterruptedly till his death in 1873, when Deekshatah admittedly took advantage of the petitioner's position as a minor and succeeded in getting the Tusdik amount paid to himself. It is true that Deekshatah has executed certain repairs to the Temple with the view of strengthening his case to succeed to the Archikship. As an important fact, it must be noticed that when Deekshatah came forward and offered to repair the temple in question, the present petitioner had also petitioned on the 16th August 1885

to the Dy

to the Dy Commissioner, saying he was prepared to execute the necessary repairs, if the Tusdik amount allowed for the Temple was given to him. The petitioners' intention, as will be observed in his Urzee dated 6th May 1886 to this office, appears to be genuine, when he offered to repay to Deekshatals the cost (as may be estimated by the Public Works Department or by Panchayets), which the latter had incurred in carrying out the repairs of the Temple. I therefore consider that the Petitioner should be the Archik of the Varada-Rajaswamy Temple, and he should also get the Tusdik amount allotted to the Temple. He must be made to pay all the money spent by

Deekshatiah on the repairs of the Temple.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most Obedient Servant.

A M Mannitus
Dy Commissioner

Mss

K

Read-

Petition dated 2d January 1887, from Srirangachar, Archak of the Varadaraja Swami temple in Bychapur, Magadi Taluq, putting forth his claims to the Archakship of the said temple.

Letter No 165 dated 8th June 1887 from the Dy Comr, Bangalore, submitting Vernacular props connected with the above case & reporting that the Petitioner is the lawful claimant & that Deekshithaln has no right to it.

Order.- Camp No. 915
Camp Nysore, 23d June 1887.

The Dewan Guilt concurs with the opinion of the Dy Commr that Deekshithaln has no manner of claim to the right of worship in the temple

The Enam (Cash & land) will be registered in the name of the temple and left in the possession of the pujari for the time being. Ver props are retd

To
The Dy Commr Bangalore

Draft. R.G.
Chief Secretary

(General Serial No. 31.)

188 .

From

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No

General No.

No.

M. No. C. 28 R

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 244

dated 18th July 1892 received at the

Dewan's Office from

Srivaishnava Sri Srinivasa Ramanuja Archak of the Varadaraja Swamy Temple at Byjapur. Adi Salem

is forwarded, ~~together with its enclosures,~~ to the

Dy Comr. Bangalore

for submission of the entire records connected therewith

By Order,

Camp Mysore
~~BANGALORE~~,
21st Sept. 1892.

Muzrai Secretary.

(General Serial No. 30)

395

189 .

70

From The Dy Commissioner
Bangalore District

To The Secretary to the Dewan,
of Mysore
Mugrodi Department

Dated 6th
Despatched } October 192
Received

Enclosures No. 1 file

General No.
D No. 375

With reference to his Memo
No 628 of the 21st Instant,
requesting submission of the
records connected with the
petition of Seenangachar
Archik of Kanadaraja
Swamy's Temple, Magadi
Taluk, has the honor to
send the same herewith.

Magady Amildar's
urgee No 42 dated 11th March/91
with parish.

Mdaingllasaw
for Dy Commissioner

To the Same no 47 8/1/92
Mus: 7 20.92

MUZARAYI.

(General Serial No. 30.)

189

From

To

The Dy Com?.
Bangalore Dt

Dated 1st

Despatched 22 Nov. 92

Received

Enclosures No. 1 file

General No. 47

Inw 7. No. 24 92

Hist No. 3157 of 6th Oct 1892
Submitting the records
Connected with the
of 18th Aug 1892. petition of Sreerangachar
Archak of the Varada-
raja Swamy Temple
Nagadi Taluq.

With reference to
the above, I have the
honor to enquire
if the Sum of Rs.
8—11—6, the Jas di Kamath
due to the Temple

From the Sameera 458 of 29/11/92.

for the 18 months
ending with June 1887
Las. Allen held in
deposit as alleged
by the petitioner

2. The records of the
Case are returned
for reference and
re-submission.

By order

A.J.

(General Serial No. 30.)

189 . 98

From The Dy Commissioner
Bangalore District

To

The Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.

Dated 24th Inuzrayi Depart
Despatched 25th November 1892
Received

Enclosures No. Records

Depd 28/11/92

General No.
D No. 458.
His docket No: 47 dated
M 24-92
1st Instant petition of
Sreerangachar Archik
of the Varadarajaswamy
temple, Nagady Taluk

In reply to the above, I have
the honor to state that the
Inadik amount of Rs 8-11-6
referred to in the above
has been brought unde
Surplus funds of the
temple and is not held
in deposit.

The Amildar's re-
port together with en-
closures received with

To the Same No 771-2
M.F. 24-92 & 3/5/93

The letter under reference is herewith re submitted.

C Nagamachari

pr Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore District

BR

MUZARAYI.

(General Serial No. 30.)

1893.

From

To D.C. Bangalore
Comptroller

Dated 3

Despatched 4 May 93

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 771-2
M.F No. 24-92

Directing the payment of
Rs 8-4-6 to Sri Rangacharya
Archak of Varadarajaswamy
temple, Bychapur, Nagar
Taluk, Coorg

To the Same No 856 dt 28/5/93
From the Same No MF 724 dt 5-9-93 × To the Same No 246-7 MF 24-92 dt 26/9/93

Proceedings of the Government of Ellpore

Muzrai

Read:—

Government Proceedings No. 397-8/14 dated 10th April 1886 directing the restoration to the Varadarajaswami temple in Bychapur, Magadi Taluk, of the Inams (land and money) resumed during the Inam Settlement.

Government Proceedings No. 915 dated 23rd June 1887 declaring the right of one Sreerungachar son of Sreenivasa Rungachar to the archikship of the above temple.

Petition dated 1st July 1892 from Sreerungachar praying for the re-payment to him of the following items:—

i. Rs 73-8-. being the Kandayam levied from him on the Inam lands during the period of their resumption

ii Rs 34-14-. being the Jasdik allowance drawn by one

Deekshita Iyengar who was performing the ~~Puja Service~~ Archaka Work in the temple during the same period.

iii Rs 8-- -6 being the amount of Jasdik allowance for 18 months which was held in deposit pending disposal of the dispute between himself and Deekshita Iyengar regarding the right to the Archakship of the temple.

Read also:—

Docket No. 458 dated 21th November 892 from the Deputy Commissioner Bangalore District, reporting that the last item of Rs 8-- 6 claimed by Sreerungachar has been credited ~~to~~ Surplus Funds.

Order thereon No. 771-2 R.F. 24-92 dt 3-5-93

Dated Bangalore 2nd May 1893.

The Petitioner Sreerungachar's

claim to the refund of the kandayam of Rs 73/8/- paid by him on the Inam lands for the period during which they were under resumption, cannot be allowed.

2. His claim for the second item - viz - Rs 34 - 14 - - the amount of Jasdik allowance drawn by Deekshita Iyengar during the 6 years when the Inam lands of the temple were under resumption appear to have been already adjusted as the same has been ordered to be deducted from the sum of Rs 315 - 3 - 3 payable by him to Deekshita Iyengar on account of the temple repairs executed by the latter.

3. The petitioner ~~is entitled only to the~~ claim for the third item, viz, ~~the~~ [redacted] of Rs 8 - - - 6 ~~which is reported by~~

~~the Deputy Commissioner to have been~~
been credited to the Surplus Funds.

4. The Government are pleased to direct the payment to the petitioner Srikungabhar, of the amount of Rs 8-0-6 which is to be met from the Surplus Fund of Rs 138-7-9 at the credit of the temple.

Secretary.

To. The Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore District.

" Comptroller to the Govt. of Mysore.

MUZARAYI.

(General Serial No. 30.)

1893.

From

To

The Dy Com.r
Bangalore Dt.

Dated 23rd

Despatched 25 May

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 856

Muzarayi. F. No. 24

Govt. Pro. No 771-2
Inam. 7-24-92

dy 3/5/93 directing the payment, to Sri Rangatha Archak of the Varadaraja Swamy Temple in Bychapura Nagadi Taluk, of the sum of Rs 8-4-6. it being the amount of Jasdik allowance for 18 months ~~held~~ ~~in deposit~~ not paid to the Temple on account of a dispute regarding the Archakship of the Math.

In Continuation of the above
has the honor to return the
Vernacular ~~proceedings~~ Records
Connected with the Case

By Order

Asst
Secy

(38)

(General Serial No. 30.)

203

1893-94

From The Dy Commissioner
Bangalore District

To

The ~~Chief~~ Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.

Muzrai Department

Dated 5th September 1893.

Despatched 7th

Received 7-9-93

Enclosures No. 1 & Papers

General No.

D No. 289.

With reference to the
Government Proceedings
No. 771-2 dated 3rd May/93.
M.F. 24-92
sanctioning the payment
of Rs 8-4-6, to Sreenivasa
Rungachar of Bychapur,
Magady Taluk.

Has the honor to for-
-ward a bill for Rs 8-4-6
for countersignature and
transmission to the Comp-
-troller for audit.

2. The Vernacular

Record

the Same to 246-7
M.F. 24-92 & 12/9/93

Records are also submitted.

[illegible]

For Dy Commissioner

Uns

MUZARAYI.

(General Serial No. 30.)

1893-4

From

To Dy Commr Bangalore
——"—— Comptroller

Dated 12" September

Despatched 15"

Received

Enclosures No. 1 file 41

General No. 246-7
Muzarayi. F. No. 24-92

Countersigning and forwarding to the Comptroller for audit a bill for Rs 8-0-6 being the amount of allowance due to Sreerangachar, Archaik of the Varadaraja Swami Temple, at Magadi Taluk.

From Comptroller No 1741 & 19/9/93

Murrai

Read: —

Govt. Pro. No. 771-2
in 724-92
d/ 3rd May 93 sanctioning
the payment of the sum of
Rs 8-0-6 being the amount
of allowance due to ~~the~~
Sreerangachar, Archik of
the Varadarajaiswami temple
in Bychapur, Magadi Taluk.

Docket No. 289 d/
5th September 1893, from the
Deputy Commr., Bangalore
Dt. submitting for Counter-
-signature a bill for the sum
of Rs 8-0-6 referred to ~~him~~.

R
No. 246-7 / 12/15/9/93
Murrai 724-92
Enl 1 file V.P.
+1

Order thereon - Rs
for 8-0-6
The bill is Counter-
-signed and forwarded
to the Comptroller for ~~—~~

for audit.

Secretary
C. C.

To

The Dy: Commrs, Bayfalone Dt
returning the Ct: papers
— & Comptroller with the bill

Draft

MUZARÁYI. 249

(General Serial No. 30.)

1893 4.

From The Comptroller to the Govt. of Mysore

To The Inam Secretary

Dated 19th September

Despatched

Received 20-9-93

Enclosures No. /

General No. 1741

Muzarayi. F. No.

Returning the bill for Rs 8-0-6 being the arrear allowance due to Sree-Rangachar, for re-transmission with necessary corrections

To the same No. 411 Dated 13/10/93

been specified therein and to
request therefore, that
the omission may be
supplied, and the bill
transmitted to this office
for audit.

I have the honor to be
Sir.

Your most obedient Servant.

E. M. Morrison

Comptroller

JL

Dr

Government Pollypore

Authority	Particulars	Amount			
Govt. Orders No. 771-2 dated 24-9-92	Amount to be drawn from the Surplus Funds of Nagadi Taluk and payments to be made to Sreerangapatna	8	4	6	
	Total	8	4	6	Rupees Eight Annas Six Only

Commissioner's Office
Bangalore 28th Aug 93

Sd. C. M. Ramaswamy
for Commissioner

MUZARAI.

(General Serial No. 30.)

1893.

From

The Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore

To The Comptroller to the Govt. of Mysore.

Dated 18 Octr. /93

Despatched 18th

Received

Enclosures No. 1

General No. 4116

Muzarai F. No. 2492

His No. 1741 dated 19th Septr. /93 returning the bill for Rs. 8-0-6, being the arrears of allowance due to Sreerangachar Archick of the Vardaraja Swami temple at Bycha[illegible] Jeur, Nagadi Taluk for [illegible] specifying the period for which the allowance is due.

With reference to the above has the honour to state that the omissi is duly supplied in bill and the same

Mysore Govt. Central Press, Bangalore.—25-9-93-1,000.

as forwarded herein
from audit.

Very